

thor: RUTH NETA at EH-07
ce: 10/28/96 8:45 AM
Priority: Normal
Receipt Requested
TO: Jonathan Samet <JSAMET@PHNET.SPH.JHU.EDU> at INTERNET
Subject: Re: Project 1.2A review -Reply

----- Message Contents -----

Jon, the "Import" system is the most reliable. The text follows. Ruth

Dear Dr. Cragle:

Your response to the Comments of the American Scientific Review Group (SRG) on your proposal on the "Physical Preservation of the Existing Data for Project 1.2" (1.2A) has been reviewed.

After careful review of your response, the SRG remains concerned that no detailed statement on how the work will be done and whether it can be done within the proposed budget has been provided.

The SRG suggests for you and your collaborators to identify an appropriate contractor who would carry out the work and prepare a detailed statement of work (including details of training) and also prepare an itemized budget to match the work statement. Such proposed contract would than be included in your proposal and used for SRG review.

Reply Separator

Subject: Project 1.2A review -Reply
Author: Jonathan Samet <JSAMET@PHNET.SPH.JHU.EDU> at INTERNET
Date: 10/28/96 8:00 AM

Ruth, can't read the text. I can read WP and WORD attachments. Jon

>>> RUTH NETA <RUTH.NETA@eh.doe.gov> 10/25/96 10:33am >>>
--IMA.Boundary.711452648
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII Content-Transfer-Encoding:
7bit
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

I am enclosing the proposed response to Donna Cragle's reply to the critique of her original proposal, reviewed in June. Drs. Howe, Rush and Samet reviewed Dr. Cragle's response. The enclosed is their suggestion for resolution of the remaining concerns for your review and comments, before they can be passed on to Donna.

I just returned after 3 weeks absence from the Office.

With best regards,

Ruth --IMA.Boundary.711452648
Content-Type: application/octet-stream; name="crg.srg"